

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----oo0oo-----

PHILLIP HOFF,

Plaintiff,

v.

COUNTY OF SISKIYOU, an  
administrative body; ANDREA FOX,  
ex-HOA manager; and DOES 1-10,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-00535 WBS JDP

ORDER RE: BILL OF COSTS

-----oo0oo-----

On March 29, 2024, the court dismissed plaintiff's federal claims with prejudice, and dismissed plaintiff's state law claims without prejudice to his right to refile them in state court. (Docket No. 52.) On April 12, 2024, defendants submitted a Bill of Costs pursuant to Local Rule 292(b). (Docket No. 60.) Defendants claim copying costs of \$81.65. (Id.) Plaintiff has not objected to the costs pursuant to Local Rule 292(c), and the time to do so has passed.

1 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) governs the  
2 taxation of costs and provides that "costs -- other than  
3 attorney's fees -- should be allowed to the prevailing party."  
4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1). 28 U.S.C. § 1920 enumerates which  
5 costs are taxable and allows for the recovery of "the costs of  
6 making copies of any materials where the copies are necessarily  
7 obtained for use in the case." 28 U.S.C. § 1920(4). "Rule 54(d)  
8 creates a presumption in favor of awarding costs to prevailing  
9 parties, and it is incumbent upon the losing party to demonstrate  
10 why the costs should not be awarded." Stanley v. Univ. of S.  
11 Cal., 178 F.3d 1069, 1079 (9th Cir. 1999).

12 After reviewing defendants' Bill of Costs, and in light  
13 of plaintiff's lack of an objection, the court finds that  
14 defendants' claimed copying costs of \$81.65 are reasonable.

15 Accordingly, costs of \$81.65 will be taxed against  
16 plaintiff.

17 Dated: April 24, 2024



WILLIAM B. SHUBB

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE